

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed June 21, 2005. Claims 1-27 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-27 were rejected. In order to expedite prosecution of this Application, Applicants amend Claims 1-5, 12, 20 and 22-27. Thus, Claims 1-27 remain pending in the Application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

As an initial matter, Applicants have amended pages 1 and 2 of the specification to include the serial numbers of the respective noted co-pending applications. Favorable action by the Examiner is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the following actions were taken or matters were raised:

DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION

Claims 1-27 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-29 of co-pending Application No. 10/001,431 (the '431 Application). Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse this provisional rejection. However, given that the above-referenced double patenting rejection is provisional, Applicants respectfully submit that upon the allowance/issuance of either the instant Application and/or the '431 Application, Applicants will address any non-provisional double patenting rejection maintained by the Examiner.

SECTION 102 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0116639 issued to Chefalas et al. (hereinafter "*Chefalas*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Of the rejected claims, Claims 1, 12 and 20 are independent. Applicants respectfully submit that *Chefalas* does not disclose or even suggest each and every limitation of independent Claims 1, 12 and 20. For example, *Chefalas* appears to disclose a data processing system for detecting a virus and sending a notification of the detected virus to a

server where the notification includes an identification of the action taken to in response to detecting the virus (*Chefalas*, abstract). However, *Chefalas* does not appear to disclose or even suggest “generating a human-readable and machine-readable vulnerability description language (VDL) file defining the security vulnerability of the computer system” where the VDL file specifies “an attack representing a recognized vulnerability of the computer system,” “at least one attribute of the specified attack,” “at least one policy definition with respect to detecting the vulnerability of the specified attack” and “a remedy for the specified vulnerability” as recited by independent Claim 1 (emphasis added). Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that *Chefalas* does not anticipate independent Claim 1.

Independent Claim 12 recites “generating a human-readable and machine-readable vulnerability description language (VDL) file defining the security vulnerability condition of the system” where the VDL file specifies “a name of a vulnerability associated with the system,” “at least one attribute of the specified vulnerability,” “a remedy for the vulnerability according to the specified computing platform,” “a policy definition with respect to the specified vulnerability” and “at least one attribute of the specified policy definition” (emphasis added), and independent Claim 20 recites “a human-readable and machine-readable vulnerability description language (VDL) file containing a definition of at least one vulnerability and a definition of at least one policy item for the vulnerability” and “an interpreter operable to parse the at least one vulnerability definition and at least one policy item definition in the VDL file and organize the parsed definitions pursuant to a predetermined format” (emphasis added). For at least the reasons discussed above in connection with independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submits that *Chefalas* does not disclose or even suggest each and every limitation of independent Claims 12 and 20.


Claims 2-11, 13-19 and 21-27 that depend respectively from independent Claims 1, 12 and 20 are also not anticipated by *Chefalas* at least because they incorporate the limitations of respective Claims 1, 12 and 20 and also add additional elements that further distinguish *Chefalas*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 2-11, 13-19 and 21-27 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

No fee is believed due with this Response. If, however, Applicants have overlooked the need for any fee due with this Response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment associated with this Response to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
James L. Baudino
Reg. No. 43,486

Date: September 21, 2005

Correspondence to:
L.Joy Griebenow
Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400
Tel. 970-898-3884